

March 7, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

4835

ermen from district are sufficient quantities of Pacific hake, when converted to fish protein concentrate, could meet the protein needs of almost 20 million people each year. This is not to mention the other species of fish available. Similar quantities can easily be found in the fishing areas off the coast of Alaska.

With the vast potential for raw materials and now that the basic research has been accomplished, let us get this program underway and enrich the world's diet in order to obtain the benefits associated with a healthy population.

PRESIDENT'S AGRICULTURE BUDGET FOR 1967

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, after a thorough analysis of the President's Agricultural budget for fiscal year 1967, I have come to the conclusion that the administration is misleading the American people at the expense of our farmers and young people.

I can find no other possible explanation for such drastic proposals as those calling for a \$101 million reduction in the school lunch and special milk programs and equally significant cuts in requested funding for our land-grant colleges and universities.

We are in the midst of an inflationary period that is playing havoc with the family budget and yet our farmers, whose per capita income still averages little more than half that of the rest of the Nation, are faced with proposals that, if followed through, will impose on them still further hardships.

Certainly, the President should exercise restraint in his nondefense spending plans, especially at this time with the uncertainties resulting from our Vietnam involvement.

However, I fail to see the logic in decreasing our commitment to bona fide programs whose worth as sound investments in our country's future has been clearly demonstrated while the Federal Government is seeking to increase its subsidy to new projects that are controversial by their very nature and highly questionable in value.

At a time when the administration's trumpets are heralding the importance of health, education, aiding our Nation's youth, and encouraging greater agriculture efficiency, it appears, according to the budget, that the President's statements are not consistent with his intentions.

We all know that the war on poverty has given rise to problems of immense magnitude and yet, rather than holding the line in spending until these problems can be resolved, the administration wants to increase, by \$463 million, the cost of this operation in the year ahead.

To me this action, in itself, is wrong; however, the error in judgment is magnified many times when it is considered in relation to other areas of the budget.

Recently, in an appearance before the House Agriculture Committee, officials of the Department of Agriculture predicted that school milk consumption will drop 1 billion half pints next year if the administration's plan to cut the school milk program is accepted.

For years this program has been recognized as one of great value in promoting the general health and welfare of our children. Time and again, campaigns to encourage all of our people to increase their consumption of milk have been launched and, as I recall, the late President Kennedy, at one of his press conferences, appealed to a nationwide audience to drink more milk. Now, suddenly, we are told that the milk program for our children is no longer of such importance.

Like a chameleon that changes color according to its mood and environment, the administration is altering its position regarding the school lunch program. First we hear convincing testimony that adequate steps must be taken to insure that our youngsters receive proper nourishment, then we receive a proposal to reduce, by \$19 million, the amount of money the Federal Government should make available to accomplish this worthy objective. Ironically, an unworkable "means test" for the recipients is proposed to still further confuse the issue.

Apparently there are individuals in the executive branch who have assigned a lesser priority to a program dealing with the nutrition of our youth than they have to one that is constantly being subjected to justified criticism for political favor and confused leadership.

As a member of the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture, I have participated in a number of conferences at which the present world food crisis has been discussed. To a member, each of us on the task force agrees that if ever there was a need for strong and viable agriculture institutions to conduct progressive agriculture experiments and to broaden our base of competent agricultural specialists, the time is now.

The administration tells us it agrees with this view—how could one do otherwise in view of the circumstances—and yet it proposes to weaken the whole structure of our land-grant college system by withdrawing millions of dollars of support when, if anything, it should be exploring just the opposite approach to the matter.

The \$463 million increase requested to widen the war on poverty is more than enough to restore the proposed cuts to sound, time-tested and beneficial programs here being discussed. I suggest that it is in order for us to overcome the failure of the administration to affix sensible priorities to these programs by taking appropriate action to insure that their present strength is maintained. At the same time, I think it would be prudent and wise for us to carefully examine the present conduct of the war in poverty before going forth blindly into further battle.

REPRESENTATIVE QUIE SUPPORTS ATLANTIC UNION

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. MAILLIARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a significant statement was issued last Thursday by U.S. Representative ALBERT H. QUIE of Minnesota in support of the resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation.

It points to the need to strengthen the Atlantic Alliance so it will serve non-military common interests as well as military. Representative QUIE has long been an effective and courageous leader in promoting free-world unification, and I call attention to the text of his recent statement, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ALBERT H. QUIE

A prominent American radio commentator (Note: Edward C. Morgan, ABC, March 1, 1966) recently suggested that perhaps the worst thing that can happen in diplomacy is success. He made the remark in commenting on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and I believe his point is well taken.

For NATO faces its darkest hour at the pinnacle of its success. If NATO is to fail now, it is because its brilliant successes in containing communism in Europe have dulled vision to its potentialities.

NATO has been brilliantly successful from a military point of view. But there is another side of the picture which holds even greater promise. This greater promise was intimated in article 2 of the original NATO Charter. In addition to military cooperation, the signatories pledged that "they will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

Economic cooperation is a facet of the NATO purpose that has never been fully explored, let alone fully utilized.

I believe that a great challenge awaits us in tightening the fabric of NATO through a United Trade Policy. I shall have more extended remarks on this subject in a few days.

The United Trade Policy is one portion of the activities that should be undertaken. Others should deal with readjusting current institutions between the NATO signatories which have changed greatly since 1949. There should be new efforts to meet the challenges that science and technology have created.

These new tools of cooperation United Trade Policy and other renewed and new institutions in other areas—could all be forged in the conference of blue-ribbon delegations proposed in the resolution which we commend to your attention and the bipartisan attention of the Congress, today.

And, at all times, we should keep clearly in view the basic goal of the NATO Charter: "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."

COMMEMORATING THOMAS MAS- ARYK'S BIRTHDAY

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. MAILLIARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

4836

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- HOUSE

March 7, 1966

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the Members of the House of the anniversary today of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, the great Czechoslovak hero. I join in commemorating the birthday 116 years ago of this illustrious leader who devoted his life to the freedom of his country. Unfortunately, the people of Czechoslovakia are now captives of communism and are forbidden to publicly celebrate this historic day by their present Red tyrants.

We in the free world must rededicate ourselves, therefore, to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Czechoslovakia and all the other captives of communism.

Thomas Masaryk was a member of the Austrian Parliament but resigned in protest against the treatment of Czechoslovak nationalists. After a number of years of writing in the fields of history and political philosophy, Masaryk formed the Czechoslovakian National Council with Dr. Eduard Benes, and it became the recognized government of Czechoslovakia. When Czechoslovakia became a republic in 1918, Masaryk was elected as its president and served in that capacity until the age of 85.

Mr. Speaker, we must not limit our interest in the freedom of the people of Czechoslovakia to the commemoration of their national days. A practical step for Congress to take would be the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Furthermore, the Voice of America should provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Czechoslovakia. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America has cut back both its hours of broadcast in the Czech and Slovak languages and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives straight news only and is fearful of offending the Soviet Union under present administration policy. However, the brave people of Czechoslovakia deserve the truth. The Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering the message of truth to them so that they would not be brainwashed and their resistance weakened by the constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

CONCERN ABOUT UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. CONSULAR CONVENTION

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. MAILLIARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House are concerned about a Senate ratification of the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Convention. There are numerous reasons for the rejection of this pact, particularly at this time when the Soviet Union is the major supplier of goods and critical arms to the Red totalitarian regime in Hanoi.

Regarding the recent case of Newcomb Mott, I request that the letter of a Senator be printed in the RECORD, followed by

the full text of a reply written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, and the edited copy as appeared in the Washington Post of December 15, 1965. Without volunteering any personal comments on these three copies, I believe that a careful reading of them by every concerned American will lead to certain inevitable conclusions as to the substance of the arguments offered and the editorial treatment of one of them. In the interest of popular information on this subject, particularly in the light of the tragic disposition of the Mott case by the Soviet Russian totalitarians, I submit these pieces for the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 22, 1965]

CONSULAR TREATY NEEDED

I share the feelings of outrage expressed in your editorial of November 5 regarding the arbitrary detention by Soviet authorities of Newcomb Mott, an American student who apparently wandered quite innocently across the Norwegian-Soviet border.

You point out in your editorial that Mr. Mott has been held in jail at Murmansk and that the American Embassy has not been given official notice of his arrest. If the Soviet-American consular treaty negotiated last year were ratified and in effect, the Soviet Government would have been obliged to notify American officials within 3 days of Mr. Mott's arrest and an American official would have had the right to visit Mr. Mott within no more than 4 days of his arrest. Had these provisions been in effect, it is even doubtful that the Russians would have detained Mr. Mott at all.

Neither the Soviet Union nor the United States has yet ratified the consular treaty although it was approved last August 3 by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a large majority. The treaty was withheld from consideration by the whole Senate because of an apparently well-founded fear that it could not command the necessary two-thirds majority. The immediate cause of substantial opposition to the treaty last September was an extensive lobbying campaign mounted by an extremist organization which professed to believe that the presence of Soviet officials in the United States would constitute a threat to our national security.

It is to be hoped that both the Soviet Union and the United States will soon ratify this sensible and advantageous treaty. Were it in effect now, the United States would be able to provide protection for Mr. Mott against arbitrary Soviet practices. Largely because of the fears of rightwing extremists the United States has been denied an effective instrument for the protection of its citizens in the Soviet Union.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,

U.S. Senator, Arkansas, Chairman,
Senate Committee on Foreign Re-
lations
WASHINGTON.

NOVEMBER 26, 1965.

To the EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST:

Senator FULBRIGHT's letter in your November 22 issue seems like a desperate attempt to capitalize on any sentiment generated by the Mott case in behalf of the defective and ill-advised consular convention with the Soviet Union. The letter is also remarkable for its gross inaccuracy and factual omissions concerning the strong opposition to Senate ratification of the treaty last summer.

First, it is pure speculation on the Senator's part that Newcomb Mott might not have been detained by the Russian totalitarians if the convention were in effect. Early notification and access to the arrested party do not add up to freedom. The so-called protection

aspect of the pact has been so exaggerated by proponents of the treaty that one wonders why they have hesitated to insist upon the principle of strict reciprocity as concerns legal treatment of arrested persons within the present framework of our diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. Aside from the general barbarity of Russian institutions, as so well illustrated by Moscow's arbitrary expulsion of your own correspondent, it is really no concession at all for colonialist Moscow to permit early notification and access.

Second, the Senator indulges in a measure of smear tactics when he paints the opposition to the treaty in the form of "right-wing extremists." The Liberty Lobby came into the act when it was practically over last August. As early as June 1964, numerous national organizations, including the National Captive Nations Committee, appealed to scores of Senators not to ratify this highly disadvantageous and legally invalid treaty. And this appeal, along with a persistent call for open and fair public hearings, was carried down to last August. It will be renewed come January 10.

Third, what the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee failed to mention was the attempt to railroad the treaty through the Senate for a blind ratification. In June 1964, the chairman promised immediate public hearings on the signed pact but quickly reversed himself when the aforementioned opposition emerged and the presidential campaign was in the offing. Then the hearings were supposed to be held at the beginning of the 89th Congress. Such hearings never came to pass. Instead, as the title of the committee's report shows, only one hearing was held, and that briefly for the Secretary of State.

Finally, what the Senator failed also to mention is the fact that there are many more reasons than just the espionage one justifying the nonratification of this second treaty of Moscow. These reasons include a diplomatic affirmation of Moscow's empire within the U.S.S.R., the legal invalidities of the treaty, an American assist to Moscow's Russification policies, an incredible diplomatic immunity given to consular personnel, opportunities for Moscow's intensified political warfare in the United States, an unwarranted basis for further political warfare by Moscow in Latin America, a most-favored nation sieve in the treaty, and the Baltic dilemma it would place us in. These are essential matters that should be freely discussed in public hearings on the treaty. It appears that advocates of the treaty fear such open, democratic discussion. At present the burden is on the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and also the Department of State to invite such discussions through public hearings, that is if they're not too fearful of an intelligent basis for the Senate's consideration of the pact.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,

Professor, Georgetown University and
Chairman, National Captive Nations
Committee.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Dec. 15, 1965]

ANSWER TO FULBRIGHT

Senator FULBRIGHT's letter of November 22 issue seems like a desperate attempt to capitalize on any sentiment generated by the Mott case in behalf of the defective and ill-advised consular convention with the Soviet Union.

It is pure speculation on the Senator's part that Newcomb Mott might not have been detained by the Russian totalitarians if the convention were in effect. Early notification and access to the arrested party do not add up to freedom. The so-called protection aspect of the pact has been so exaggerated by proponents of the treaty that one wonders why they have hesitated to insist upon